



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WHAT PROGRAM SHALL THE UNITED STATES STAND FOR IN HER RELATIONS WITH JAPAN AND CHINA—THE PROBLEM AND A PRACTICAL SOLUTION

BY SIDNEY L. GULICK, D.D.,
New York.

The international relations of the United States fall naturally into three principal groups: those, namely, of our relations with Europe, with Latin America, and with the Far East, and constitute three distinct problems. The right solution of each of these problems is of the highest importance to the welfare, not only of the United States, but to the other countries also. I confine my discussion to the third group, and shall consider only the question of our relations with Japan and China.

The great world-problem of the twentieth century is undoubtedly the problem of the contact of the East and the West. Whether it shall bring weal or woe depends largely on the United States. Shall our Oriental policy be based on national selfishness with race pride, arrogance and disdain? Shall it be devoid of sympathy? And shall we rely on military might for carrying it through? Or shall we above all things seek to give justice, courtesy and a square deal? Considering only our own interests and stamped by ill-founded suspicion and falsehood, shall we set up our Oriental policy in complete disregard of their problems, needs and feelings? Or shall we remove dangers of conflict by a policy of friendly consideration and genuine helpfulness? Shall we observe both the spirit and the letter of our treaty obligations, or shall we continue to disregard both the spirit and the letter, holding as obligatory and sacred only such clauses as conform to our selfish interests?

To these questions America must give answer in practical shape in the course of the coming decade. If matters are allowed to drift and the natural impulses of the natural man control our national policies, the nature of our answers can be readily foretold. Only the nation-wide study of this new world-problem by millions of our citizens can develop such knowledge and conviction on these matters that right relations with Asia may finally be established.

Let me present with utmost brevity a sketch of the problem and of the method for its solution.

A New Asia

Mankind has entered on a new era. Races and civilizations for ages separated and self-sufficient are now face to face; their interests are rapidly commingling. New relations are being established between the East and the West, between the masterful white nations and the hitherto peaceful and submissive peoples of Asia. All great races whether of the East or of the West are proud, ambitious, determined. These qualities are part cause of their greatness.

Old and New Japan

When Japan first came in contact with the white man, 1550-1600, she welcomed him. She gave him full opportunity. About a million Japanese, it is believed, became Christian. Then when Japan learned of the white man's aggressions and ambitions for world conquest, she concluded that the white man meant a White Peril, to avoid which she turned him out, exterminated Christianity and for 250 years carried out her policy of exclusion most completely.

In 1853 Japan woke to discover how belated and helpless she was, due to her exclusion policy. She wavered for a decade, suffered revolution due to different conceptions as to the right policy to take in dealing with the white man and finally late in the sixties adopted her new policy,—that of learning the secrets of the white man's power, in order to maintain national existence and honor on a basis of equality with the white man. This has been Japan's controlling ambition for fifty years. Her success, her war with Russia proclaimed. Japanese cannon at Mukden were heard around the world proclaiming to the white man the end of his undisputed supremacy, and to the races of Asia the way in which to meet the White Peril. All Asia awoke to hope and effort.

Japan is Misunderstood

There is, however, wide misunderstanding as to what Japan asks. She does not ask for free immigration for her laborers. She recognizes that any large entrance of Japanese into California

would produce both economic and racial difficulty. She is ready to do whatever may be needful consistent with national honor and dignity to save America from embarrassment on both lines, as her faithful administration of the "Gentlemen's Agreement" witnesses and her recent adjustment of the laws dealing with expatriation. She is willing to continue holding back all Japanese laborers from coming to this country.

What Japan Earnestly Pleads For

What Japan does ask and asks earnestly is that there shall be no invidious and humiliating race legislation which shall involve her fair name. Japan stands for national honor in international relations. For this she has been strenuously striving for half a century. Is the maintenance of friendship possible between two nations when one insists on humiliating the other?

Old China

For ages China was so vast, preponderant, self-sufficient and self-satisfied that she simply ignored the white man when he appeared on her horizon. Even the wars by which England forced opium upon her did not apparently disturb her much.

But when port after port was taken by foreign powers; when Germany took Kiao Chao for the killing of two missionaries; and when Russia took Port Arthur after it had been forced back from Japan; when England took Wei-hei-wei and France Kwan-chau-wan; and when foreigners were gaining mining rights and railroad concessions throughout China, Chinese began to realize that something must be done, or they would soon cease to exist as a self-governing people.

China's first reaction was like Japan's, namely, demand for a policy of exclusion. That brought on the Boxer uprising (1900). It was, however, too late. The armies of the Allies relieved Peking and proved to China that the white man and Western civilization could neither be excluded nor ignored. They imposed upon her as penalty an indemnity, far in excess of expenses, amounting to \$687,566,705.

China Learns from Japan

After a few years of vacillation, confusion, turmoil and revolution, came Japan's victory over Russia (1905), which announced to the world that an Asiatic race can hold its own against the white

man and that the way by which to do it is to learn all that the white race knows. China listened and learned.

One month after Japan made peace with Russia, China abolished her system of classical education, over two thousand years old, and started on the new policy. Since then China has been introducing western education, western science, western political life at a tremendous rate. The Manchu dynasty is gone. The characteristic Chinese queue is gone from large sections of the country. We now have a new China, ambitious, energetic, resourceful, progressive and becoming self-conscious. Her young men by the hundred thousand are learning western ways. As a short cut to western knowledge tens of thousands of Chinese students have been in Japan.

Some decades will doubtless be needed before China will reach the stage of political stability and occidentalization already reached by Japan. But she will get there as surely as time moves onward. And when that time comes her demand for "most favored nation treatment" will be loud and insistent.

Asia's Appeal to America

Both China and Japan are facing mighty problems. The early solution of those problems concerns, not themselves alone, but all the world. Our fate is in truth involved in theirs. The urgency accordingly of their appeal should command our earnest and sympathetic attention and secure our action. Our own national welfare through the long future, no less than our national character, are intimately involved in our response to that appeal. China's appeal for justice and friendly treatment was made decades ago, but has been completely ignored by the statesmen and Christians of America. Japan's appeal is more recent. Will America heed it any better?

The story of our dealings with China is, as a whole, one of which we need not be ashamed. We have not seized her territory, bombarded her ports, extracted indemnities or pillaged her capitals as have other nations. On the contrary, we have helped preserve her from "partition" at a grave crisis in her relations with western lands. We returned a considerable part of the Boxer indemnity that came to us. We have stood for the open door and a square deal. Our consular courts have been models of probity

and justice. The work of our missionaries in hospitals, education, and in famine and flood relief has been highly appreciated.

In consequence of such factors the Chinese as a nation hold today a highly gratifying attitude of friendship toward us.

America's Treatment of Asiatics

When we turn, however, to the story of what many Chinese have suffered here, our cheeks tingle with shame. The story would be incredible were it not overwhelmingly verified by ample documentary evidence. Treaties have pledged rights, immunities and protection. They have, nevertheless, been disregarded and even knowingly invaded; and this not only by private individuals, but by legislators, and administrative officials. Scores of Chinese have been murdered, hundreds wounded and thousands robbed by anti-Asiatic mobs, with no protection for the victims or punishment for the culprits. State legislatures, and even Congress, have enacted laws in contravention of treaty provisions. Men appointed to federal executive offices have at times administered those laws and regulations in highly offensive methods.

The Scott Law of 1888 and the Geary Law of 1892 are still in force, though the essential injustice of some of their provisions and their disregard of Chinese treaty rights have long been recognized. They are producing constant anti-American feeling among Chinese legitimately in America.

With regard to the Scott Law, Senator Sherman said that it was "one of the most vicious laws that have passed in my time in Congress." It was passed as a "mere political race between the two houses . . . in the face of a Presidential election." Senator Dawes sarcastically referred to keeping the treaties as long as we had a mind to. The law was "a rank unblushing repudiation of every treaty obligation . . . unwarranted by any existing danger—a violation such as the United States would not dare to commit toward any warlike nation of Europe."

The Chinese Minister steadily protested against the plain violation of treaty; just preceding the Geary Act, he wrote six letters to Mr. Blaine, only two of which were so much as acknowledged. He declared that the Geary Act was worse than the Scott Act, for it not only violated every single article of the treaty of 1880 but also denied bail, required white witnesses, allowed arrest without

warrant and put the burden of proof on the Chinese. He quoted our own statement on the harsh and hasty character of the act, not required by any existing emergency, whose political motive was well understood both in China and the United States. In his final protest he said: "The statute of 1892 is a violation of every principle of justice, equity, reason and fair dealing between two friendly powers."

Believing that the law would be pronounced unconstitutional because of its plain contravention of the treaty, the Chinese carried their case up to the Supreme Court.

Judge Field, who presented the judgment of the court, said: "It must be conceded that the act of 1888 is in contravention of the treaty of 1868 and of the supplemental treaty of 1880, but it is not on that account invalid. . . . It (a treaty) can be deemed . . . only the equivalent of a legislative act, to be repealed or modified at the pleasure of Congress. . . . It is the last expression of sovereign will and must control." "The question whether our government was justified in disregarding its engagements with another nation is not one for the determination of the courts. . . . This court is not a censor of the morals of the other departments of the government."

This makes it clear that a treaty is not the "supreme law of the land," except as Congress makes and keeps it so.

An Ominous Situation

If the faithful observance of treaties between the nations of Europe constitutes the very foundation of civilization, as we are now vehemently told, is not the faithful observance of treaties with Asiatics the foundation of right relations with them? Do not treaties have moral aspects which should place them on a higher level of authority than the ordinary acts of Congress. Disregard of this fundamental principle for the maintenance of right international relations is fraught with ominous consequences. Congress, of course, has the power to abrogate a treaty, but there is a right and also a wrong way to do it. Is it right for a nation to abrogate an inconvenient treaty by simply passing laws in contravention to certain of its pledges? Is it conceivable that Congress would have treated China as it has, had she been equipped as Japan is today, with the instruments of occidental civilization?

Now when China becomes equipped with a daily press and adequate world news, when her national organization becomes better unified, more efficient and better equipped, when her self-consciousness is more perfectly developed, and when she learns that Chinese entering America have often suffered ignominious treatment, that Chinese lawfully here are deprived of rights guaranteed by long standing treaties, and that privileges granted as a matter of course to individuals of other nations are refused to Chinese on exclusively racial grounds, is it not as certain as the sunrise that Chinese friendship for America will wane and serious possibilities develop?

The situation is serious but there is no crisis. China and Japan have given up sending in useless protests. But I wish earnestly to press the point that before they feel impelled to raise the issue again we should ourselves voluntarily and without external pressure of any kind rectify our laws and our treatment. By so doing, the warmth and genuineness of their friendship which would surely arise cannot easily be estimated.

A New Oriental Policy

Is it not clear that America needs a new Oriental policy? The New Orient renders obsolete and dangerous our nineteenth century Asiatic policy. Let us promptly adopt *a policy which, while it will provide, on the one hand, for the just demands of the Pacific Coast States to be protected from swamping Asiatic immigration; will nevertheless also provide, on the other hand, for full justice and courtesy of treatment and for complete freedom from race discrimination which is inevitably regarded as humiliating.* The new policy should provide for observance of the spirit no less than of the wording of our treaties, and be thus in harmony with the principles of good neighborliness.

America's crucial problem with Asia lies, not in Asia, but in America. Not our diplomacy in the Far East, but our treatment of Asiatics in the Far West is to be determinative of our Oriental relations. I therefore omit altogether from consideration in this necessarily brief paper the question of our foreign diplomacy and confine my discussion to practical suggestions for the solution of our domestic problem.

All this means that we need comprehensive immigration legislation dealing with the entire question in such a way as to conserve American institutions, protect American labor from dangerous

economic competition, and promote intelligent and enduring friendliness between America and all the nations, East and West, because free from differential race treatment.

Outlines of a Comprehensive Immigration Policy and Program

Let me give in briefest outlines a policy and a program that seems to fulfill the requirements.

1. *The Control of Immigration*

Immigration from every land should be controlled, and, if excessive, it should be restricted. The principle of restriction should be applied equally to every land, and thus avoid differential race treatment.

2. *Americanization the Principle of Control*

The proven capacity, for genuine Americanization on the part of those already here from any land should be the measure for the further immigration of that people. Newcomers make their first contact with America through those who speak their own language. The Americanization, therefore, of newcomers from any land depends largely on the influence of those already here from that land. The number of newcomers annually admissible from any land, therefore, should be closely dependent on the number of those from that land who, having been here five years or more, have actually become American citizens. These know the language, customs and ideals of both peoples, ours and theirs.

America should admit as immigrants only so many aliens from any land as she can Americanize.

3. *The Proposed Restriction Law*

Let, therefore, an immigration law be passed which provides that the maximum permissible annual male immigration from any people shall be a definite per cent (say five) of the sum of the American-born children of that people plus the naturalized citizens of the same people.

The grandchildren as a rule do not know their ancestral language, and therefore do not aid particularly in the Americanization of newcomers.

In general there would be no restriction on immigration from

North Europe. The reverse, however, would be the case for the countries of South Europe. The permissible immigration from China and Japan would be less than that which has been coming in recent years.

Provision should be also made for the protection of all newcomers from ruthless exploitation and for their distribution, employment and rapid Americanization. To aid in the accomplishment of these ends, the federal government should establish—

4. *A Bureau of Registration*

All aliens should register annually until they become American citizens, and should pay an annual registration fee, of say ten dollars. We need to know who the aliens are and where they live, and they need to know that we know these facts about them. A system of registration could be worked out in connection with a National Employment Bureau as suggested by the late Professor Henderson that would not involve police surveillance. This Bureau should be regarded as a method for friendly aid, not of hostile and suspicious control.

5. *A Bureau for the Education of Aliens for Citizenship*

This Bureau should set standards, prepare textbooks, promote the establishment of night schools by states, cities and towns—which might receive federal subsidies—and hold examinations. The education and the examinations should be free. Provision should be made for the reduction of the registration fee by, say one dollar, for every examination passed. The education should be simple and practical, avoiding merely academic proficiency. Let there be six examinations, three in English and one each in the History of the American People, in the Methods of our Government, local, state and federal, and in the Ideals of Democracy. When all the examinations have been passed, there would still remain the annual registration fee of four dollars, so long as the individual chooses to remain an alien.

6. *New Regulations for the Bureau of Naturalization*

Citizenship should be granted only to those who have passed the required examinations provided by the Bureau of Alien Education and have maintained good behavior during the five years of probationary residence. The naturalization ceremony might well

take the form of a dignified welcome service—say on a single day in the year—the Fourth of July, with appropriate welcome orations, banners, badges and banquets.

7. Citizenship for all Who Qualify, Regardless of Race

Eligibility to naturalization should be based upon personal qualifications of intelligence, knowledge and character. The mere fact of race should be neither a qualification nor a disqualification.

Such are the main outlines of the proposed Comprehensive and Constructive Program here offered for the solution of the entire immigration problem, Asiatic as well as European. For an adequate understanding, however, of this general proposal we should consider many details which are here necessarily omitted.

Advantages of this Policy

Would not the above proposals for a Comprehensive and Constructive Immigration Policy coördinate, systematize and rationalize our entire procedure in dealing with immigration, and solve in a fundamental way its most perplexing difficulties? Such a policy would protect American labor from danger of sudden and excessive immigration from any land. It would promote the wholesome and rapid assimilation of all newcomers. It would regulate the rate of the coming of immigrants from any land by the proven capacity for Americanization of those from that land already here. It would keep the newcomers always in the minority. It would be free from every trace of differential race treatment. Our relations with Japan and China would thus be right.

Such a policy, therefore, giving to every people the “most favored nation treatment,” would maintain and deepen our international friendship on every side.

An Objection

I am not ignorant of objections to these proposals that have been raised by a few critics. They assert that Asiatics and especially Japanese are not assimilable. They love to quote the famous lines from Kipling:

Oh, East is East and West is West,
And never the twain shall meet
Till earth and sky stand presently
At God's great judgment seat.

They, however, who quote these lines, forget or never heard the lines that immediately follow:

But there is neither East nor West,
Border nor breed nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face,
Tho' they come from the ends of the earth.

There are indeed real differences between the East and the West, yet there is also real and still deeper unity.

This is a question of great importance and deserves careful study. I have not failed to consider it with some care in my volume on the "American Japanese Problem." But after all the question is not really relevant to the general proposals here put forward. The permissible immigration proposed would be considerably less than that which is now coming from Asia under present laws. The question of assimilability of Asiatics, therefore, cannot be raised as an objection to this 5 per cent restriction proposal. On the contrary, should not those who urge Asiatic non-assimilability advocate this policy rather than oppose it?

Conclusion

I return now to the questions with which we began. Shall America's Oriental policy be based upon national selfishness and race pride or upon the Christian ideal of universal human brotherhood and Golden Rule internationalism? That will depend largely on the character of the leadership of our nation in our international affairs. Will our most expert thinkers on the problems of political and social science grapple earnestly and scientifically with this problem of Oriental immigration and assimilation in the Occident? Will we lead our institutions of learning to devote their earnest thought and study to the promotion of wholesome thoughts and attitudes upon this entire question of races and their relations? Will we teach our people to discard antiquated or one-sided conceptions as to race biology and psychology which promote race arrogance and prejudice?

The problem of world-peace is not primarily the problem of treaties, arbitration provisions and Hague Courts, but of mutual goodwill and confidence among the nations. How can this spirit be developed? If Asia fears and distrusts Christendom because of continued injustice, Asia will arm. As Asia arms Christendom

will increasingly fear and distrust her. The way to establish goodwill and mutual confidence between the East and the West is for Christendom to act toward Asia in right and helpful ways. We must voluntarily do her justice, keep our treaties and deal with all Asiatics who come to our lands in ways that we ourselves would like to receive were we in their place.

In a word, the international relations of nations, as of individuals, must be Christian if there is to be world-peace and wholesome development. Nations must not only be just and honest, but they must be kindly and helpful. They must regard and treat each other on the basis of universal human brotherhood. This and this alone will evoke real goodwill and mutual trust.

As an American missionary long resident in Japan I appeal to the citizens of America on behalf, not of Japan alone, but also of Asia; nor yet on behalf of Asia alone, but of the whole world, including our own beloved land. For on the right attitude of the West to the East hangs the fate of the whole world for centuries to come.